

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-41 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 24 have been amended.

In response to the office communication of 1/11/2006, claims 1 and 24 have been amended. Applicant believes all remaining claims are drawn to the elected invention. Claims have been amended relative to the claims entered into the image file wrapper on February 17, 2005.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 23, 24, 32, 34, 37-39, 41, 42, 44, 47-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker, U.S. Patent 6, 113, 492 in view of Chamoff et al., Barakai, et al., and Nair, et al. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Examiner relies on Walker to teach the details of a gaming machine. Chamoff, Barakai, and Nair do not describe gaming machines. The present invention, as recited in the pending claims, describes a master gaming controller designed or configured "to load gaming software for execution from a memory using one or more configuration files that specify the gaming software to load wherein the one or more configuration files allow the gaming machine to be loaded with gaming software that is customized to operational requirements of a particular gaming jurisdiction and wherein the loaded gaming software includes player tracking software." The gaming machines of Walker do not teach or suggest this limitation. The remaining references are silent in regards to this limitation.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 23, 24, 32, 34, 37-39, 41, 42, 44, 47-53 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Claims 5, 8, 35 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in View of in view of Chamoff et al., Barakai, et al., and Nair, et in further view of Acres 6,317, 852.

Examiner relies on Acres in regards to displays and progressive and bonus games. The combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai, Nair and Acres does not correct the deficiencies described with respect to the combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair and Acres, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 5, 8, 35 and 40 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Claims 9, 10 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in View of Chamoff, Barakai and Nair in further view of Lichtman 5, 819,107.

Examiner relies on Lichtman in regards to software drivers and protocols. The combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair and Lichtman does not correct the deficiencies described with respect to the combination of Walker and Chamoff, Barakai and Nair above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair and Lichtman, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 9, 10 and 25-31 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in View of Chamoff, Barakai and Nair in further view of Boushy 6, 183,362.

Examiner relies on Boushy in regards to networks. The combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair and Boushy does not correct the deficiencies described with respect to the combination of Walker and Chamoff, Barakai and Nair above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair and Boushy, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 13 and 14 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Claims 17, 21, 22 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in View of Chamoff, Barakai and Nair in further view of Acres 5,702,304.

Examiner relies on Acres to teach details of a player tracking system. The combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai, Nair and Acres does not correct the deficiencies described with respect to the combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair and Acres, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 17, 21, 22 and 33 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in View of Chamoff, Barakai and Nair in further view of Pease (5,766,076) and Kelly (6,293,865).

Examiner relies on Pease and Kelly in regards to input devices. The combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair, Kelly and Pease does not correct the deficiencies described with respect to the combination of Walker and Chamoff, Barakai and Nair above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair, Pease and Kelly, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 20 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY


FEB. 8. 2006 4:15PM

5106630920

NO. 855 P. 13

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


David P. Olynick
Reg. No.: 48,615

Beyer, Weaver & Thomas LLP
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100